

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 18th January, 1985

No. 9/5/884-6Lab./345.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal :—

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 370/1982

between

SHRI SURESH KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL DAIRY RE-
SEARCH INSTITUTE, KARNAL

Present.—Shri Raj Kumar for the management.
None for workman.

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section-10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Suresh Kumar, workman and the Management of National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Suresh Kumar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. In the claim-statement filed on 13th February, 1982, it was alleged that the claimant was employed by the respondent on 17th August, 1979 as Driver in the Cattle Yard Section of the National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal and rendered meritorious services. It was then alleged that the services of the claimant were terminated on 26th October, 1981 by the respondent without giving any show-cause notice or serving any charge-sheet which was against the rules of natural justice and as such, the claimant was entitled to reinstatement with full back wages.

3. The respondent, in their written statement, dated 4th January, 1983, pleaded that the respondent-institute was not an industry as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, nor the claimant was a workman. It was further pleaded that the services of the claimant were terminated on account of misbehaviour, etc., the details of which were given in the written statement.

4. The claimant, in his replication, dated 22nd March, 1983, reiterated the pleas taken in the claim-statement.

5. A preliminary objection has been raised by the respondent to the effect that respondent is a research station of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, which is under the control of the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, and that the respondent-institute functions under the authority of the Central Government and that the appropriate Government competent to deal with any industrial dispute is only the Central Government and as such, the reference made by the Haryana Government is bad in law. It has been argued that Indian Council of Agricultural Research is an autonomous body and was financed by the Government of India. In para No. 6 of the appointment letter, it is mentioned that the appointment may be terminated without, assigning any reason by one month notice on either side under rule 5 of the Central Civil Service (Temporary Service) Employees Rules, 1965, as applicable *mutatis-mutandis* to the employees of the Council. Rule 2-A of the rules of Indian Council of Agricultural Research lays down that the expression 'Society' means the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1850. Reliance has been placed on the award, dated 29th October, 1982, passed by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madurai, in which it was held that the Central Tobacco Research Institute Research Station, Veda sandur was being run under the Authority of the Government of India and that the appropriate Government would be the Central Government to make any reference under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It may be mentioned that, according to the latest amendment in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which came into force on 21st August, 1984, the scientific research or training institutes have been excluded from the scope of the expression 'Industry' as defined in Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The present dispute between the parties however arose prior to the coming into force of this amendment in as much as reference was made in the year, 1982. Therefore, the preliminary objection raised by the respondent prevails and it is held that the reference made by the Haryana Government is not proper and as such, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to decide the present reference. The award is passed accordingly.

R.N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 10th January, 1985.

Endst. No. -56, dated the 10th January, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana and Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 22nd January, 1985

No. 9/5/884-6Lab/461.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of the Manyola Co-operative Credit Service Society Ltd. Manyola (Ambala) :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V.P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
AMBALA AT AMBALA CITY

Ref. No. 31 of 1984

SHRI GURDIAL SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE MANYOLA CO-
OPERATIVE CREDIT SERVICE SOCIETY LIMITED, MANYOLA (AMBALA)

Present :—

Shri Rajeshwar Nath for the workman.

Shri K.L. Kalra for the Respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred,—vide clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute between Shri Gurdial Singh, workman and the Management of the Manyola Co-operative Credit Service Society Limited, Manyola (Ambala). The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Gurdial Singh, workman was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled to ?”

To trace out the brief history of the litigation between Shri Gurdial Singh, workman and the Manyola Co-operative Credit Service Society Limited, Manyola (Ambala) briefly narrated the facts as alleged by the parties are as under:

Workman Gurdial Singh alleged that he was appointed as Clerk on 1st August, 1979. His services were terminated on 3rd March, 1984, at that time he was drawing monthly wages @ Rs. 420 P.M. Workman further alleged that his termination is illegal because no notice was served upon him, one month's pay was not paid to him and no retrenchment compensation was awarded to him.

Respondent contested the case contending that Co-operative Society does not cover within the purview of the Industrial Disputes, 1947, it was also agitated that on receipt of letter of Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Haryana, Chandigarh, it was observed that the transaction of the society was less than 20 lacs, so strength of employees was justified only upto four in number while strength was 6 so applicant-workman and one more person were found surplus in staff, so their services were terminated according to law. It was also contended that applicant-workman had drawn excessive pay in the tune of Rs. 3,840 as per audit report he was entitled to get pay Rs. 300 P.M. while he was drawing Rs. 420/- P.M. His one month pay of the period of notice and compensation for the retrenchment were adjusted against the outstanding amount and even now Rs. 2,790 are still due towards him.

Workman filed replication and controverted the allegations of the respondent.

On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed :—

Issues—

- (1) Whether services of applicant were illegally terminated on 3rd March, 1984, if so, its effect ? OPA
- (2) Whether Industrial Disputes Act is not applicable in the case in hand ? OPR
- (3) Whether application is not maintainable for want of Notice under the Punjab Co-operative Societies Act, 1961 as alleged ? OPR
- (4) Whether respondent has not been properly, sued, if so, its effect ? OPR
- (5) Whether applicant has drawn excess amount from respondent in the tune of Rs. 3,804-00, if so, its effect as alleged ? OPR
- (6) Relief?

I have heard Shri Rajeshwar Nath for applicant and Shri K.L. Kalra for the respondent and have gone through the oral as well as documentary evidence placed on the file. My issue-wise findings are as under :

Issue No. 1—

This is the main issue in the dispute finding on this issue will decide the destiny of the parties.

Respondent in support of his case examined Shri Dayal Singh, Secretary, Mini Bank, Nanyola as MW-1. In his statement he nowhere stated that any notice regarding the termination of services of the applicant was issued to the applicant or was served upon him. His statement further lacks regarding payment of one month pay, as well as retrenchment compensation.

It is a settled law that regarding the termination of services, notice in the prescribed *pro forma* as provided under section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 shall be given, one month pay shall be given and compensation for retrenchment be also given.

It is also settled law that once the management has enhanced the pay of a particular employee such a benefit should not be snatched from him. It does not be in the mouth of respondent to say that applicant had drawn excessive pay from the respondent and that amount was adjusted towards one month pay and compensation of this witness Statement (Shri Dyal Singh) clearly shows that no entry regarding the above adjustment was ever carried out in the Cash Book. Resolution of the society copy of the same is Ex-M-13 was never adopted by the society. No resolution regarding adjustment of disputed pay was ever passed by the management. Prior to the day of termination, i.e., 2nd March, 1984, no such orders were passed that pay of workman be reduced from Rs. 420 P.M. to Rs. 300 P.M. There is no resolution or order regarding issue of one month notice or 24 hours notice nor any resolution regarding payment of one month pay or compensation of retrenchment. All this shows that order of the respondent regarding the termination of the services of the workman obviously contravention of section (25 F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, so this order is declared illegal and this issue is decided in favour of the applicant-workman and against the respondent.

Issue No. 2—

On this issue the arguments advanced by the Ld. counsel for respondent are not well founded. He could not support his arguments with any law. On the contrary, I hold that the dispute in question, is covered under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, so this issue is decided against the respondent and in favour of the workman.

Issue No. 3—

In this context I would only like to say that even remedy under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 can be availed of without any notice to the department and the dispute in question is maintainable because this matter was referred by the applicant to the Government of Haryana, who further referred it to this Court for disposal, so such a point cannot be agitated at this platform. This issue is also decided against the respondent in favour of the applicant.

Issue No. 4—

This issue was not pressed nor any arguments were advanced, so it is decided against the respondent.

Issue No. 5—

This issue in fact I have already covered in my discussion on my Issue No. 1, I am of the view that pay of the applicant-workman, was raised by the management of the society. According to that he had been drawing his pay, it is settled law that once a benefit is granted by the employer to its employee that cannot be withdrawn, so this issue is also decided against the respondent and in favour of the applicant.

Issue No. 6

The learned counsel for the respondent argued that after coming in force of averted Act of Haryana Co-operative Societies jurisdiction of Labour Court has been barred. In this context I would only like to say that this Act has been made applicable w.e.f. 15th October, 1984 and not from retrospective effect, so jurisdiction of the Court to dispose of this dispute in hand is not all barred.

In view of my issue-wise findings I ordered that the applicant is entitled to re-instatement from the date of his termination and all other benefits which would have been available to him while in service. Regarding the dispute in question I pass my award accordingly.

Dated 5th January, 1985

V.P. CHAUDHARY
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 91, dated Ambala City, the 16th January, 1985

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Govt., Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

The 21st February, 1985

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/916.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s The Avon Scales Company, E-33, Industrial Area, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 14 of 79

between

SHRI GAJ RAJ, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S THE AVON SCALES COMPANY,
-33, INDUSTRIAL AREA, SONEPAT

Present :

Shri S.N. Solanki, A.R. for the workman.
Shri D.C. Gandhi, A.R. for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Gaj Raj and the management of M/s. The Avon Scales Company, E. 33, Industrial Area, Sonapat to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. SPT/135-77/1075, dated 8th January, 1979:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gaj Raj was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. In nutshell the case of the workman is that he was working with the respondent as a skilled Fitter since 1969 on monthly wages of Rs. 280 and was placed under suspension, on 13th November, 1976 for deliberately delaying the testing of platform machine No. 30, 31 and 32 and the allegations were baseless and that he never tore into pieces the charge-sheet issued to him and that the management had appointed Shri Surinder Kumar its Accountant as Enquiry Officer and an umbrage against the same was taken by him but his objection was not heeded to and the Enquiry Officer choose to conduct an *ex parte* enquiry and that no report of the Enquiry Officer was ever supplied to him. So, the workman has alleged that his termination was in gross violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A very detailed reply rebutting all the allegations has been filed by the respondent. The preliminary pleas taken are that the reference is bad in law, because services of the workman were dispensed with after a valid and proper enquiry was conducted and the workman was given chance to participate in the same but he did not do

so deliberately. Further the reference is bad on this account also that the reference is delayed one. Another objection taken is that the workman remained gainfully employed after termination of his services, because he started his own dairyfarm and was keeping about five buffaloes. On merits also, it is denied that the workman was appointed in the year 1969. It is alleged that he was appointed on 13th May, 1970 and that the workman was issued a charge-sheet for certain negligent acts committed by him on 14th November, 1976 and thereafter on 15th November, 1976 and replies to the same were also filed by the workman. It is denied that the workman was got beaten from the police after being called in the Factory Manager's office. However, it is alleged that it was the workman who assaulted the Factory Manager and thereafter ran away. It is further alleged that the workman had left certain defects while testing machine No. 30, 31 and 32 and for this negligence he was issued charge-sheet. It is further alleged that the workman is a gangster of ill repute accustomed to use brawn then brain. It is further alleged that the appointment of the Enquiry Officer was the prerogative of the management and the workman was no body to impose upon the management an Enquiry Officer of his own liking or choice. It is also immaterial that the Enquiry Officer was not well versed in labour laws and so the request of the workman for change of Enquiry Officer was not accepted and the workman was informed the decision of the management in that behalf but he deliberately absented himself from the enquiry proceedings and under these circumstances the Enquiry Officer was constrained to conduct an *ex-parte* enquiry. Further the management has placed on record complete enquiry file. In the replication filed by the workman he has controverted the various pleas taken by the respondent.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 4th June, 1979:—

- (1) Whether the reference is bad in law as the demand notice was not served on the management within the reasonable time ?
- (2) Whether the workman was dismissed from his service after proper enquiry in accordance with the provisions of natural justice and law ?
- (3) Whether the termination of service of Shri Gaj Raj was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
- (4) Whether the workman has been gainfully employed for how much period and what effect ?

5. Subsequently my learned predecessor Shri B.R. Goel,—*vide* his order, dated 7th July, 1979 directed that issue No. 2 regarding domestic enquiry shall be treated as preliminary issue. Under these circumstances, I propose to confine my decision to this issue alone.

6. Both the parties were allowed to adduce their evidence on this issue. The management examined MW-1 Enquiry Officer Shri Surinder Kumar and MW-2 Shri Ved Parkash, partner of the respondent. The workman appeared as his own witness as WW-1. I have heard the learned Authorised Representatives of the parties. My findings on issue No. 2 regarding domestic enquiry are as under:—

Issue No. 2

7. To prove this issue the management examined Enquiry Officer Shri Surinder Kumar as MW-1. He was appointed Enquiry Officer,—*vide* order Ex. MW-1/1, MW-1/2 and Ex. MW-1/3 and copies of the charge-sheet. Copies of the replies to the charge-sheet filed by the workman are EMW-2/1 and Ex. MW-2/2. Ex. MW-1/4 and MW-1/5 are the letters,—*vide* which the workman was given opportunity to appear before the Enquiry Officer and MW-1/7 is the copy of the enquiry report. MW-2 Shri Ved Parkash also stated about the charge-sheet issued to the workman signed by Shri Pritam Lal, Factory Manager and also about the appointment of the Enquiry Officer. He further stated that after going through the enquiry report he found it expedient to dispense with the services of the workman.

8. Workman Shri Gajraj appeared as his own witness as WW-1 and stated that he is employed with the respondent since 1969 on monthly wages of Rs. 280 and that on 14th November, 1976 he was asked by the Works Manager as to whether machine has been tested or not and that the Factory Manager passed a directive counter to the one issued by the Works Manager and that when he sought clarification from the Factory Manager he got angry and abused him and that the Factory Manager directed the Works Manager to suspend him and that he was given a charge-sheet in English of which he sought a translation copy in Hindi and that he was got beaten by 4-5 persons by the management and was handedover to the police in which he was acquitted on 19th May, 1978 and that he had raised an objection against the appointment of the Enquiry Officer,—*vide* letters Ex. WW-1/2 and WW-1/3 but the Enquiry Officer was not changed by the management.

9. The learned Authorised Representative of the workman Shri S.N. Solanki forcefully contended that since the Enquiry Officer Shri Surinder Kumar was the son of Shri B.D. Bhutani, Works Manager, who in turn is the brother of Shri Pritam Lal, a partner of the respondent concerned, so the workman was completely justified in his apprehension that he does not expect a fair and proper enquiry from Shri Surinder Kumar. In that behalf he was placed strong reliance upon 1972 SLR 723 K, *Sundara Rajan V/s. Deputy Inspector-General*

of Police, Tiruchirapalli and others. In the authority under reference it was held that the Enquiry Officer shall not be personally interested in the matter, and should be a person having an open mind, a mind which is not biased against the charged officer. In this case, the aggrieved employee facing enquiry had levelled serious allegations against the Enquiry Officer, who happened to be immediate senior officer and that very officer was appointed as Enquiry Officer thereby depriving the employee an opportunity of cross examining him and in that situation it was held that the enquiry was vitiated. In the present case, there is no allegation against the Enquiry Officer that he was biased against the workman or even that he was a relation of the Works Manager of the respondent concern, though question of relationship was raked up by the workman during the course of arguments. His only objection was that since the Enquiry Officer was an Accountant of the respondent and not well conversant with the labour laws, he was not fit person to hold enquiry. This point raised on behalf of the workman that the workman should have appeared before the Enquiry Officer and placed his objection before him rather than absenting himself from the enquiry proceedings. No such course was adopted by the workman and in the process he earned *ex-parte* report,—*vide* which he was held guilty of all the charges levelled against him. The management has placed on record entire enquiry proceedings conducted by the Enquiry Officer and I see no infirmity in the procedure adopted by Enquiry Officer. The workman was given two opportunities through letters to appear before the Enquiry Officer but he chose to absent himself on the flimsy grounds that the Enquiry Officer should be changed being Accountant of the respondent and further being non-conversant with labour laws. I have gone through the enquiry report and also the statement of the witnesses recorded during the enquiry proceedings. The report of Enquiry Officer is well reasoned and based upon facts revealed during the enquiry. The report is Ex. MW-1/7. Other authorities cited on behalf of the management were AIR 1978 Orissa 172 Ram Chandra Dass V/s. Hira Lal Modi, AIR, 1968 Manipur 68 Satkhosei Thango V/s. President Distt. Soldiers Sailors and Airmen's Board Manipur, 1968 PLR 19 Darshan Singh V/s. Arjun Singh and others, 1970 Lab. I.C. 1029, Dr. S.C. Agrawal V/s. General Manager, Hindustan Steel Ltd. and 1977 Lab. I.C. 104 Abdul Rahman V/s. E.I.D. Parry Ltd. The last authority was cited to rebut the contention raised on behalf of the workman that before passing order of termination final show cause notice was not given to the workman. Other authorities referred to above, cited on behalf of the management have got a peripheral bearing upon the facts of the present case and as such, need not discuss or distinguish the same.

10. The crux of my foregoing discussion is that a valid and proper enquiry was held by the management before passing order of termination passed against the workman and as such this issue is answered in favour of the management.

11. In view of my decision of the preliminary issue holding that a valid and proper enquiry was held by the management before passing order of termination against the workman, other issues need not be gone into and in terms of the same this reference is answered and returned against the workman but there is no order as to costs.

Dated the 2nd January, 1985.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst No. 14/79/157, dated the 25th January, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6 Lab./917.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Administrator, Municipal Committee, Kharkhoda (Sonapat) :—

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 248 of 83

between

SHRI RAGHUBIR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ADMINISTRATOR,
MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE, KHARKHODA (SONEPAT)

Present.—

Shri S.N. Solanki, A.R. for the workman.
Shri B.S. Malik, A.R. for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Raghubir Singh and the management of M/s. Administrator, Municipal Committee, Kharkhoda (Sonapat), to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 61689—94, dated 23rd November, 1983 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raghubir Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the workman is that he was employed as Sweeper with the respondent since 21st May, 1980 on monthly wages of Rs. 300 and that his services were terminated by the respondent unlawfully on 31st January, 1982 and that the order of termination contravenes the provisions of section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, because no prior notice or retrenchment compensation was given to him before termination of his services.

3. Reply furnished by the respondent, most of the allegations made in the claim statement have been admitted. It is alleged that the workman had been told verbally that letter has been received from the Government of Haryana that recruitment should be made after getting the name sponsored through the Employment Exchange.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issue was settled for decision, on 12th October, 1984—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raghubir Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. The management examined witness MW-1 Shri Bhim Singh, clerk and the workman appeared as his own witness as WW-1. I have heard their learned Authorised Representatives of the parties. My findings on the issue framed are as below :—

Issue No. 1 :

6. There is no dispute between the parties that the workman was employed in the month of May, 1980. It is also undisputed that his services were terminated on 31st January, 1982 after a lapse of more than one year eight months. It is not alleged or proved by the respondent that the workman remained absent during this period. So, the workman had under all circumstances actually worked with the respondent for more than 240 days during the last 12 calendar months from the date his services were terminated, and as such the respondent was not justified in terminating his services without complying with the mandatory provisions of section 25.F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The grotesque ground of termination put forth on behalf of the respondent was that instructions had been received from the Government of Haryana that employees employed without their names being sponsored through Employment Exchange, should not be retained in service. Under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, no distinction has been contemplated between the employees employed through Employment Exchange or otherwise. So, there is no difficulty in holding that the order of termination of services of the workman was *void ab initio* and as such not sustainable in the eyes of law.

7. In the light of my foregoing discussion, order of termination of services of the workman is set aside and the workman is ordered to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 3rd January, 1985.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 248/83/158, dated 25th January, 1985

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.